



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,105	02/06/2007	Beat A. Imhof	SER-108C1	3550
23557 7590 07/08/2009 SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO Box 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614				
EXAMINER BASKAR, PADMAVATHI				
ART UNIT 1645		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 07/08/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/579,105

Applicant(s)

IMHOF ET AL.

Examiner

Padma V. Baskar

Art Unit

1645

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26, 27, 29 and 42-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26, 27, 29 and 42-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/3508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/12/06 and 6/5/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application.
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response and Amendment

1. Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of group I, claims 26(a), 27-33 and 42-45, in the paper filed 4/27/09 and the amendment is acknowledged and entered.

Status of claims

2. Claims 1-25 and 30-41 are cancelled.
Claims 26, and 27 have been amended.
Claims 26-27, 29, 42-45 are pending and are under examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed on 5/12/06 and 6/5/07 have been reviewed and a signed copy of each is attached to this office action.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b). Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 26-27 and 29, are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 23-25, 37 -42, 44, 46-55, 57, 59-60 and 63-65 of copending Application No. 10738123, filed 12/18/2003. Although the conflicting claims

Art Unit: 1645

are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims encompass compositions comprising the same H33 antibodies, 13H33 hybridoma, or fragments.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 26-27, 29, 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 27 and 42 recite the term "derivative" and the term is indefinite because the specification fails to define the term "derivative." Therefore, it is not clear what is retained in the derived product that is traceable from the source material. When one product is derived from another, it is often quite different from the starting or source material. The term "derivative" does not place any clearly defined boundaries on the structure or function that is retained in the product from the source.

"The composition of matter" in claims 27 and 29 lack proper antecedent basis .

In claim 26, "the same specificity" lacks antecedent basis and is not clear what is intended as encompassed by "the" specificity, e.g. merely binding to the JAM-C antigen or having all specificities because of shared CDRs

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 26-27, 29, 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention, and failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, i.e. failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, fails to provide an adequate written description of the invention and failing to provide an enabling disclosure, because the specification does not provide evidence that the claimed biological materials are: (1) known and readily available to the public; (2) reproducible from the written description; or, (3) deposited in compliance with the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.801-1.809.

It is unclear if cell lines which produce antibodies having the exact chemical identity and properties of the antibodies designated H33 produced by the hybridoma 13H33 are known and publicly available, or can be reproducibly isolated without undue experimentation. Accordingly, filing of evidence of the reproducible production of the cell lines and antibodies necessary to practice the instant invention or filing of evidence of deposit is required. Without a publicly available deposit of the above cell lines, one of skill in the art could not be assured of the ability to practice the invention as claimed. Exact replication of: the claimed cell line; the cell lines which produce the chemically and functionally distinct antibodies claimed; and/or, the claimed antibody's amino acid or nucleic acid sequence is an unpredictable event. For example, very different VH chains can combine with the same VL chain to produce antibody binding sites with nearly the same size, shape, antigen specificity, and affinity. A similar phenomenon can also occur when different VH sequences combine with different VL sequences to produce antibodies with very similar properties. These observations indicate that divergent variable region sequences, both in and out of complementarity-determining regions (CDRs), can be folded to form similar binding site contours, which result in similar immunochemical characteristics. Therefore, it would require undue experimentation to reproduce the claimed H33 monoclonal antibody species chemically as produced by the hybridoma designated 13H33. A suitable deposit of the hybridoma would satisfy the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. See the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.801-1.809.

If, as indicated at page 4 of the specification, the deposits are made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by applicant, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, stating that the specific biological materials have been deposited under the Budapest Treaty, that the biological materials will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent and that the biological materials will be replaced should they ever become non-viable, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein.

10. Claims 26-27, 29, 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1645

The Written Description Guidelines for examination of patent applications indicates, "the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical characteristics and/or other chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show applicant was in possession of the claimed genus." (see MPEP 2163).

The claims are drawn to a labeled angiogenesis inhibiting molecule and a method of binding an angiogenesis inhibiting molecule to JAM-C

comprising a label and an angiogenesis inhibiting molecule selected

a. the antibody H33, produced by hybridoma 13H33 as deposited with the Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH under the deposit accession number DSM ACC2622, and fragments or derivatives thereof that have the same specificity as H33;

(b) a humanized antibody based on H33 and having the same specificity as antibody H33;

(c) a chimeric antibody based on H33 and having the same specificity as antibody H33;

(d) a fragment of H33 selected from:

i a Fab fragment;

ii a Fv fragment;

III a single domain antigen binding fragment;

iv a scFv, a dimer of a scFv, a trimer of a scFv and a larger aggregate of a scFv; or

v; a recombinant antibody having the binding specificity of H33 or a human monoclonal antibody having the binding specificity of H33 .

Thus, the scope of the claims includes a genus of H33 antibodies i.e., derivatives and /or a single domain antigen binding fragment and the genus is highly variant, inclusive to numerous structural variants because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. The specification teaches a single native functioning "antibody H33 produced by hybridoma 13H33. The specification does not place any structure, chemical or functional limitations on the variants embraced by "derivatives or a single domain antigen binding fragment". The recitation of "derivatives or a single domain antigen binding fragment" does not convey a common structure or function and is not so defined in the specification. Although the specification teaches that variants can be readily screened, the specification and the claim do not provide any guidance on the structure of the polypeptide and what changes can or can not be made. For example, Lederman et al (Molecular Immunology 28:1171-1181,

Art Unit: 1645

1991) disclose that a single amino acid substitution in a common allele ablates binding of a monoclonal antibody (see entire document). Li et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 77:3211-3214, 1980) disclose that dissociation of immunoreactivity from other activities when constructing analogs (see entire document). The amino acid sequences and conformations of each of the heavy and light chain CDRs are critical in maintaining the antigen binding specificity and affinity, which is characteristic of the immunoglobulin. It is expected that all of the heavy and light chain CDRs in their proper order and in the context of framework sequences which maintain their required conformation, are required in order to produce a protein having antigen-binding function and that proper association of heavy and light chain variable regions is required in order to form functional antigen binding sites (Paul, page 293, first column, lines 3-8 and line 31 to column 2, line 9 and lines 27-30). Even minor changes in the amino acid sequences of the heavy and light variable regions, particularly in the CDRs, may dramatically affect antigen-binding function as evidenced by Rudikoff et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 79(6):1979-1983, March 1982). Rudikoff et al. teach that the alteration of a single amino acid in the CDR of a phosphocholine-binding myeloma protein resulted in the loss of antigen-binding function. "A patentee will not be deemed to have invented species sufficient to constitute the genus by virtue of having disclosed a single species when ... the evidence indicates ordinary artisans could not predict the operability in the invention of any species other than the one disclosed." *In re Curtis*, 354 F.3d 1347, 1358, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004). For inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus. See, e.g., *Eli Lilly*.

Further, it is not sufficient to define it solely by its principal biological property, because an alleged conception having no more specificity than that is simply a wish to know the identity of any material with that biological property. Per the *Enzo* court's example, (*Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.*, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (CA FC 2002) at 1616) of a description of an anti-inflammatory steroid, i.e., a steroid (a generic structural term) couched "in terms of its function of lessening inflammation of tissues" which, the court stated, "fails to distinguish any steroid from others having the same activity or function" and the expression "an antibiotic penicillin" fails to distinguish a particular penicillin molecule from others possessing the same activity and which therefore, fails to satisfy the written description requirement. Similarly, the function of binding to the claimed antibodies does not distinguish a particular derivative/single domain antigen fragment from others having the same activity or function and as such, fails to satisfy the written-description requirement. Applicant has not disclosed any relevant, identifying characteristics, such as structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, sufficient to show possession of the claimed genus. Mere idea or function is insufficient for written description; isolation and characterization at a minimum are required. A description of what a material does, rather than what it is, usually does not suffice. *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

Structural features that could distinguish "derivatives and /or a single domain antigen binding fragment" in the genus from others in the protein class are missing from the disclosure and the claims.

Art Unit: 1645

No common structural attributes identify the members of the genus. The general knowledge and level of skill in the art do not supplement the omitted description, because specific, not general guidance is needed. Since the disclosure does not describe the common attributes or structural characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, the function of the binding of antibody alone is insufficient to describe the genus of "a derivatives or a single domain antigen binding fragment" of that function equivalently. One of skill in the art would reasonable conclude that the disclosure of antibody H33, does not provide a representative number of species of antibody H33 to describe the claimed genus and as a consequence antibodies that bind such. As such, generic polypeptide sequences that are unrelated via structure and function are highly variant and not conveyed by way of written description by the specification at the time of filing. As such the specification lacks written description for the highly variant genus of single function antibody and one skilled in the art would not recognize that applicants had possession of the genus of claimed antibody as instantly claimed. Therefore, only the antibody H33, but not the full breadth of the claim meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115). Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the genus of derivatives and /or a single domain antigen binding fragment as claimed.

11. Claims 26-27, 29, 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a labeled angiogenesis inhibiting molecule and a method of binding an angiogenesis inhibiting molecule to JAM-C comprising a label and an angiogenesis inhibiting molecule selected

a. the antibody H33, produced by hybridoma 13H33 as deposited with the Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH under the deposit accession number DSM ACC2622, and fragments thereof that have the same specificity as H33;

(b) a humanized antibody based on H33 having all CDRs, and therefore all binding specificities, of the H33 antibody

(c) a chimeric antibody based on H33 having all CDRs, and therefore all binding specificities, of the H33 antibody

(d) a fragment of H33 selected from:

i a Fab fragment;

ii a Fv fragment;

iii a single VH and VL domain antigen binding fragment;

iv a scFv, a dimer of a scFv, a trimer of a scFv and a larger aggregate of

Art Unit: 1645

a scFv; or

v; a recombinant antibody having the binding specificity of H33 or a human monoclonal antibody and therefore all binding specificities, of the H33 antibody, does not reasonably provide enablement for a derivative and /or single domain antigen-binding fragment of the H33 antibody. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in *Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir.1988). The court in *Wands* states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the breadth of the claims, (2) the nature of the invention, (3) the state of the prior art, (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, (5) the relative skill of those in the art, (6) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (7) the presence or absence of working examples, and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. Although the quantity of experimentation alone is not dispositive in a determination of whether the required experimentation is undue, this factor does play a central role. For example, a very limited quantity of experimentation may be undue in a fledgling art that is unpredictable where no guidance or working examples are provided in the specification and prior art, whereas the same amount of experimentation may not be undue when viewed in light of some guidance or a working example or the experimentation required is in a predictable established art. Conversely, a large quantity of experimentation would require a correspondingly greater quantum of guidance, predictability and skill in the art to overcome classification as undue experimentation. In *Wands*, the determination that undue experimentation was not required to make the claimed invention was based primarily on the nature of the art, and the probability that the required experimentation would result in successfully obtaining the claimed invention. (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1406). Thus, a combination of factors which, when viewed together, would provide an artisan of ordinary skill in the art with an expectation of successfully obtaining the claimed invention with additional experimentation would preclude the classification of that experimentation as undue. A combination of *Wands* factors, which provide a very low likelihood of successfully obtaining the claimed invention with additional experimentation, however, would render the additional experimentation undue.

In regards to the antibody of the invention and the breadth of the claims the broadest interpretation that applies is derivatives and single domain antigen binding fragment

The nature of the invention is preparing an antibody H33 that has been shown to be an angiogenesis inhibiting molecule.

3-4. The state of prior art and the level of predictability in the art.

It is well established the formation of an intact antigen-binding site of antibodies routinely requires the association of the complete heavy and light chain variable regions of a given antibody, each of which consists of three CDRs or hyper variable regions, which provide the majority of the contact residues for the binding of the antibody to its target epitope (Paul, *Fundamental Immunology*, 3rd Edition, 1993, pp. 292-295, under the heading "Fv Structure and Diversity in Three Dimensions"). The amino acid sequences and conformations of each of the heavy and light chain CDRs are critical in maintaining the antigen binding specificity and affinity, which is characteristic of the immunoglobulin. It is expected that all of the heavy and light chain CDRs in their proper order and in the context of framework sequences which maintain their required conformation, are required in order to produce a protein having antigen-binding function and that proper association of heavy and light chain variable regions is required in order to form functional antigen binding sites (Paul, page 293, first column, lines 3-8 and line 31 to column 2, line 9 and lines 27-30). Even minor changes in the amino acid sequences of the heavy and light variable regions, particularly in the CDRs, may dramatically affect antigen-binding function as evidenced by Rudikoff et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 79(6):1979-1983, March 1982). Rudikoff et al. teach that the alteration of a single amino acid in the CDR of a phosphocholine-binding myeloma protein resulted in the loss of antigen-binding function. Colman P. M. (Research in Immunology, 145:33-36, 1994) teaches that even a very conservative substitution may abolish binding or may have very little effect on the binding affinity (see pg. 35, top of left column and pg. 33, right column). Additionally, Bendig M. M. (Methods: A Companion to Methods in Enzymology, 1995; 8:83-93) reviews that the general strategy for "humanizing" antibodies involves the substitution of all six CDRs from a rodent antibody that binds an antigen of interest, and that all six CDRs are involved in antigen binding (see entire document, but especially Figures 1-3). Similarly, the skilled artisan recognized a "chimeric" antibody to be an antibody in which both the heavy chain variable region (which comprises the three heavy chain CDRs) and the light chain variable region (which comprises the three light chain CDRs) of a rodent antibody are recombined with constant region sequences from a human antibody of a desired isotype (see entire document, but especially Figures 1-3). While there are some publications, which acknowledge that CDR3 is important, the conformations of other CDRs as well as framework residues influence binding. MacCallum et al (J. Mol. Biol., 262,732-745, 1996) analyzed many different antibodies for interactions with antigen and state

Art Unit: 1645

that although CDR3 of the heavy and light chain dominate, a number of residues outside the standard CDR definitions make antigen contacts (see page 733, right col.) and non-contacting residues within the CDRs coincide with residues as important in defining canonical backbone conformations (see page 735, left col.). The fact that not just one CDR is essential for antigen binding or maintaining the conformation of the antigen binding site, is underscored by Casset et al (Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications, 307:198-205, 2003), which constructed a peptide mimetic of an anti-CD4 monoclonal antibody binding site by rational design and the peptide was designed with 27 residues formed by residues from 5 CDRs (see entire document). Casset et al also states that although CDR H3 is at the center of most if not all antigen interactions, clearly other CDRs play an important role in the recognition process (page 199, left col.) and this is demonstrated in this work by using all CDRs except L2 and additionally using a framework residue located just before the H3 (see page 202, left col.). Thus, the state of the art recognized that it would be highly unpredictable that antibody comprising a variable region but comprising less than all six CDRs of a parental antibody, derivatives and/or a single domain antigen binding fragment with a desired specificity would retain the antigen-binding function of the parental antibody.

5. The relative skill in the art.

The relative skill in the art as it relates to the method of the invention is characterized by that of a M.D. or Ph. D. level individual.

6-7. the amount of guidance present and the existence of working examples.

The applicant has not provided guidance for making and using antibody derivatives or single domain antigen binding fragment of H33 and the specification is totally silent in regards to using said derivatives or single domain antigen binding fragment in inhibiting angiogenesis.

8. The quantity of experimentation necessary.

The amount of experimentation that is required is undue: while making antibody H33, humanizing antibodies, chimeric antibodies, Fab and Fv fragment, scFv or VHH is routine but making derivatives or single domain antigen binding fragment requires more experimentation. Therefore, in view of the overly broad scope of the claims, the lack of guidance and working examples provided in the specification, and the high degree of unpredictability as evidenced by the prior art, undue experimentation would be necessary for a skilled artisan to make and use the entire scope of the claimed invention.

It must be noted that the issue in this case is the breath of the claims in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the skill level of the artisan and the

Art Unit: 1645

guidance presented in the instant specification and the prior art of record. The Applicants make and test position is inconsistent with the decisions of *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) where it is stated that "... scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art...". Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, for the instant specification to be enabling, it needs to provide direction/guidance regarding an acceptable number of different derivatives of antibody H33 Absent sufficient guidance/direction one of skill in the art would not be able to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims. Thus, In view of the lack of the predictability of the art to which the invention pertains as evidenced by Paul W. E. and Rudikoff et al, Colman P. M., Bendig M. M., MacCallum et al and Casset et al, the lack of guidance and direction provided by applicant, and the absence of working examples, undue experimentation would be required to practice the claimed derivatives or single domain antigen binding fragment. Therefore, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner that reasonably correlates with the scope of the claims, to be considered enabling.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claims 26, 29 and 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Aurrand-Lions et al. (J. Biol. Chem. 276: 2733, 2001 see IDS 5/12/06) in light of Bazzoni (Curr. Opin. Cell Biol. 15: 525, 2003, see IDS 5/12/06).

Aurrand-Lions et al. disclose a rat monoclonal antibodies specific for JAM-C, in light of Bazzoni, including the 13H33 monoclonal antibody (see e.g. Fig. 3). As these antibodies are the same, it is inherent that it blocks angiogenesis as well as block interaction of JAM-c with JAM-B. The antibodies of the reference inherently comprise all six CDRs and thus read on fragments as instantly claimed. The disclosed antibodies have been shown to bind to JAM-C, therefore, it meets the method claims 42-45. Since the Patent and Trademark Office does not have the facilities and resources to provide the factual

Art Unit: 1645

evidence needed in order to establish that there is a difference between the reagents of the prior art and those instantly disclosed. The burden is upon applicant to present such factual evidence. See e.g. In re Best (195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977)) or Ex parte Phillips (28 USPQ2d 1302 (BPAI 1993)).

Conclusion

14. No claims are allowed.

15. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600, AU 1645 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be transmitted via the PTO Fax Center, which receives transmissions 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. The transmission of such papers by facsimile must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30, November 15, 1989. The Right Fax number is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PMR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PMR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PMR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Padma Baskar Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272 0853. A message may be left on the Examiner's voice mail system. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6.30 a.m. to 4.00 p.m. except First Friday of each bi week.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Mondesi can be reached on (571) 272-0956.

Respectfully,
/Padma V Baskar/
Examiner, Art Unit 1645

/Robert B Mondesi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1645